

NP Best Practices Matrix

1/15/2008



Please Note: All items from 1- 44 were developed and agreed to by the WNPO (Wireless Number Portability Operations) team.

Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Industry Documentation Referenced	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
0001	10/9/01	Yes			Time Stamp on SV Create	The WNPO decided that for an inter-species port (between wireless and wireline) the time stamp on an SV create sent to the NPAC must be set to zero. For wireless-to-wireless SV creates, specific times can be set. There are still some operational problems associated with the time stamps today, and they may be exacerbated with the introduction of wireless porting.
0002	10/9/01	Yes			Type 1 Trunk Conversion	Recommend that project management processes be put in place for Type 1 trunk conversions.
0003	12/10/01	Yes			BFR Contact Information	Sending the BFR form to the recipient contact information in the WNPO BFR Matrix or the LERG contact information guarantees that you have made the request for another service provider to support long-term Local Number Portability (LNP) and open <u>ALL</u> codes for porting within specified Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) and the specified wireline switch CLLI (Common Language Location Identifier) codes. The intended recipient is responsible for opening the necessary codes for porting. It is the recipient's responsibility for ensuring that the contact information in the WNPO BFR Matrix and/or the LERG is correct.
0004	12/10/01	Yes			N-1 Carrier Methodology Clarification	<p>The N-1 carrier (i.e. company) is responsible for performing the dip, not the N-1 switch. If there is a locally terminated call then the originating carrier needs to perform the dip, because they cannot be sure whether the tandem switch belongs to the N-1 carrier or the N carrier (terminating carrier). For all local terminations the originating carrier needs to perform the dip, however, for any calls going through an IXC the IXC must perform the dip. Following are examples that were discussed:</p> <p>a) Wireless to a ported local wireless – the originating wireless carrier should perform the dip (unless they intend to default route and pay the terminating carrier to perform the dip for them).</p> <p>b) Wireless to a ported local wireline – the originating wireless carrier should perform the dip, since they cannot be sure whether a tandem switch belongs to a different carrier than the terminating switch (unless they intend to default route and pay the terminating carrier to perform the dip for them).</p>

Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Industry Documentation Referenced	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
0005	1/7/02	Yes	FCC 3 rd Report and Order (FCC 01-362)		BFR Requirements	The NRO 3 rd Report & Order, released on 12/28/01, clarified that BFRs (Bonafide Requests) are not needed within top 100 MSAs – all codes within the top 100 MSAs must be open for porting by 11/24/02. This applies to both wireline and wireless SPs.
0006	1/9/02	Yes			Sufficient Testing Prior to Turn-Up	Service providers must sufficiently test all equipment prior to turning it up in production. If service providers are unable to complete sufficient testing they should not turn up equipment that is not ready for production use.
0007	2/4/02	Yes			Database Query Priority	Number portability queries should be performed prior to HLR queries for call originations on a wireless MSC.
0008	3/10/03				DELETED	Team consensus was to remove this issue.
0009	3/4/02	Yes			Ensuring Timely Updates to Network Element Subsequent to NPAC Broadcasts	The appropriate network elements should be updated with the routing information broadcast from the NPAC SMS within 15 minutes of the receipt of the broadcast.
0010	3/4/02	Yes			No NPAC Porting Activities During the SP Maintenance Windows	NPAC porting activities should not be carried out during the service provider maintenance window timeframes AND service providers should start maintenance at the start of the window.
0011	3/4/02	Yes			NeuStar Application Process	At a minimum, NeuStar recommends that all SPs start the application process with NeuStar no later than July 1, 2002 to secure the necessary NeuStar resources in order to comply with the mandated dates. A carrier cannot begin participation in intercarrier testing until the application process is completed.
0012	4/8/02	Yes	NANC Inter-Service Provider LNP Operations Flows		Wireless Reseller Flows	The WNPO took a vote on 4/8/02 and decided that Option B (as described in a contribution from Sprint), an alternative wireless reseller flow, would be used instead of those documented in the Technical, Operational and Implementation Requirements document (Option A). The flows and narratives for Option B will be documented in upcoming WNPO meetings.
0013	4/9/02	Yes	FCC 3 rd Order on Reconsideration and NPRM (FCC 02-73) & FCC 3 rd Report and Order (FCC 01-362)		FCC 3 rd Order on Reconsideration and NPRM (FF 02-73)	The issuance of the FCC 3 rd Order on Reconsideration and NPRM (FCC 02-73) in March 2002 has caused uncertainty within the wireless industry. The WNPO has agreed upon the assumptions below in an effort to minimize the uncertainty and effectively manage the implementation of WLNP and pooling. 1) Wireless service providers participating at the WNPO are agreeing to open all their codes within the Top 100 MSAs prior to 11/24/02 (without receiving a BFR), regardless of whether BFRs are required in the future. The original mandate specifies that BFRs must be submitted no less than nine months prior to implementation. 2) Wireless service providers participating at the WNPO will

Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Industry Documentation Referenced	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
						assume the Top 100 MSAs are those defined in the 3 rd NRO Report and Order – FCC 01-362 issued in December 2001 (including CMSAs). Note: Participating service providers are defined as those in attendance at the 4/8/02 WNPO meeting.
0014	4/23/02	Yes	INC Central Office Code Assignment Guidelines (COCAG) Forms Part 2 Job Aid		Paging Codes	Paging Codes should not be marked as portable in the LERG. Refer to the Telcordia™ Routing Administration (TRA) Central Office Code Assignment Guidelines (COCAG) Forms Part 2 Job Aid for additional information.
0015	5/14/02				Deleted	Team consensus was to remove this issue.
0016	5/14/02	Yes			LRN Assignments	Wireless carriers should define their LRNs per switch, per LATA, per wireless point of interconnect (in the case of multiple points of interconnect to multiple LECs in the same LATA).
0017	5/14/02	Yes			Troubleshooting Contacts	Carriers should update their troubleshooting contact information on the NIIF (Network Interconnection & Interoperability Forum) website under www.atis.org .
0018	5/14/02				Deleted	Team consensus was to remove this issue.
0019	6/10/02	Yes			Clearinghouse Maintenance Windows	Maintenance on all systems used exclusively for LNP should be scheduled to occur during the regular Service Provider Maintenance Window that occurs each Sunday morning.
0020	08/13/02	Yes	OBF Local Service Request (LSR)		NPDI Field on LSR	In a wireline to wireless port, the applicable entry for the NPDI field on the LSR is a value of "C". On an SPSR, the NPDI field is not applicable.
0021	11/25/02	Yes			Permissive Dialing Periods	Due to the fact that wireless and wireline service providers will be sharing codes in the pooling/porting environment, extended Permissive Dialing Periods for wireless service providers can no longer be supported.
0022	11/25/02	No	Rules and Regulations for Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, CG Docket No. 02-278 and CC Docket No. 92-90		Porting/Pooling and Telemarketing	In a pooling or porting environment, there will be a potential impact from telemarketers after November 24, 2002 on the wireless customer. As required by current law, it remains the responsibility of the Telemarketing Industry to ensure that wireless customers are not adversely impacted (see Rules and Regulations for Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, CG Docket No. 02-278 and CC Docket No. 92-90).
0023	2/25/03	No			Vertical Services Database Updates	The recommendation is that all Service Providers analyze their internal processes by which the various databases are updated with their individual database provider to assess timing requirements and determine potential issues. This will be placed on the decision recommendation matrix.
0024	3/10/03				Deleted	Team consensus was to remove this issue.
0025	4/07/03	No			In-Vehicle Services	The process of porting a vehicle MDN is based on a formal arrangement between any and all impacted partners.


Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Industry Documentation Referenced	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
0026	7/10/03		OBF Local Service Request (LSR)		10-Digit Trigger	As a reminder to wireless carriers: In your agreements with wireline trading partners make the 10-digit trigger functionality a default and to the extent that you are issuing an LSR for a third party provider, ensure the 10-digit trigger box on the LSR is checked.
0027	7/10/03				Retail Holiday Hours	If Service Providers [mutually] agree to do the Inter-carrier Communication Process on holidays then by default the Service Providers agree to follow normal intervals for concurrence in order to complete the port.
0028	10/14/03				Deleted	Team consensus was to remove this issue.
29	12/8/03			FORT	ICP Hours of Operation	ICP process should be able to support porting 24 X7 and it is up to the trading partners to add additional restrictions.
30	2/2/04			WNPO	NPA Splits (this was updated on 4/5/2004.)	<p>It is the recommendation of the OBF Wireless Committee (Issue 2570) that beginning at the start of permissive dialing the new service provider would initiate the port request using the new NPA/NXX. The old service provider must do the translation to the old NPA/NXX in their OSS if needed. Note: it is the responsibility of both providers, old and new, to manage the numbers during PDP ensuring that the TN is not reassigned in their systems during permissive dialing.</p> <p>Note: Once NNPO has reviewed and provided feedback this document will be updated and reposted.</p>

Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Industry Documentation Referenced	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
						 D:\NPA Splits1.doc 5/14/04 Update: NNPO has not responded with any updates.
31	2/2/04		NANC Inter-Service Provider LNP Operations Flows	WNPO	NPAC Port Prior to Confirmation	Raise awareness within the industry that a NSP must receive a positive response before a “create” is sent to the SOA. Ensure that all personnel are properly trained on the correct, agreed upon industry process. Please refer to the official NANC flows for the exact process to be followed.
32	2/3/04			WNPO	Port Protection	<p>WNPO agreed to recommend (non-binding) that service providers utilize the following method to remove port protection from customer accounts that had port protect in place:</p> <p>“Provide the customer with a password/pin number they can use to remove the port protection service from their account. The new service provider would then send the password/pin number in the WPR to the old service provider authorizing the removal of the port protection service and the port to the new service provider.”</p>
33	4/5/04		WNPO NP Best Practices Document	WNPO	Best Practices	<p>This contribution documents specific industry guidelines agreed upon among trading partners since Nov. 24, 2003.</p>  D:\Best Practices FINAL (WNPO4-11).d
34	9/8/04		INC CO Code Reallocation Process	LNPA-WG PIM 41 V6	SPID Migrations	<p>A SPID migration is allowed to occur before the Telcordia LERG™ Routing Guide effective date provided, however, that the effective date is no later than the following Wednesday. In general, however, SPID migrations should be scheduled on or as soon after the published Telcordia LERG™ Routing Guide as possible.</p> <p>Additionally, service providers are urged to follow the processes listed below for required SPID changes:</p>

Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Industry Documentation Referenced	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
						<p><u>INDUSTRY SPID CORRECTION SELECTION PROCESS:</u></p> <p>If No Ported or Pooled Numbers Exist In The Code(S) Affected By The Move:</p> <p>If no ported or pooled numbers are in the code, the new code holder should contact the current code owner as shown in the NPAC to have the code deleted in the NPAC. The new code holder will then add the code in the NPAC under their SPID.</p> <p>If Ported or Pooled Numbers Exist In The Code(S) Affected By The Move:</p> <p>1. Coordinated Industry Effort: The new code holder should identify the number of ported and/or pooled TNs within the NXX(s) in question and the number of involved service providers to determine if this option is feasible. Based on the number of involved service providers, the new code holder should coordinate a conference call to determine if the delete/recreate process is acceptable among all affected service providers. If this process is deemed acceptable, the affected service providers shall coordinate the deletion and recreation of all ported and/or pooled TN records in the code(s). Note that the delete/recreate process is service affecting for those ported and/or pooled subscribers. Type of customer should also be considered when determining if this option is feasible. It is recommended that this process be considered when there are five (5) or fewer Service Providers involved and less than one hundred and fifty (150) working TNs and no pooled blocks.</p> <p>2. NANC 323 SPID Migration: If Option 1 above cannot be used to change NXX code ownership in NPAC, the industry preferred process is to perform a NANC 323 SPID migration.</p> <p>3. CO Code Reallocation Process: The following process should be considered only as a last resort when Options 1 and 2 above cannot be used to change NXX code ownership in NPAC! Service providers may utilize the CO Code Reallocation Process (pooling the blocks within the code at NPAC).</p> <p>When ported numbers exist, Service Providers are to determine</p>


Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Industry Documentation Referenced	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
						which of the above 3 options best fit their needs based on time constraints, number of carriers involved, number of SVs involved, type of customer, etc.
35	2/11/05		NANC Inter-Service Provider LNP Operations Flows	LNPA-WG PIM 47v4	Abandoned Ports	<p>This is the solution only when a carrier has not or is unable to use the recommended cancel process as documented in the NANC Process Flows.</p> <p>Most wireless carriers have agreed to follow the following two scenarios. Other carriers can have different intervals and processes for determining when a port is abandoned. Those carrier's business rules for identifying an abandoned port and when and how they will purge the abandoned port from their records will be posted on their LNP web sites.</p> <p>Scenario 1 – This scenario applies to the service providers that use the NPAC activation notice before disconnecting the porting end using customer. When the Old Service Provider (OSP) has confirmed the port request but does not receive an activation notice from NPAC, they can consider the port request abandoned 30 calendar days after the due date. In a similar process, the NPAC purges pending Subscription Versions (SVs) 30 days after their due dates have passed.</p> <p>Scenario 2 - The OSP has responded to a port request with a Resolution Required requiring subsequent activity from the NSP. If no subsequent activity has been received within 30 calendar days, then the port may be considered abandoned.</p>
36	4/7/05		NANC Inter-Service Provider LNP Operations Flows	LNPA-WG	Porting Obligations	VoIP service providers along with Wireless and Wireline service providers, have the obligation to port a telephone number to any other service provider when the consumer requests, and the port is within FCC mandates. Porting of telephone numbers used by VoIP service providers should follow the industry porting guidelines and the NANC Inter-Service Provider LNP Operations flows.
37	5/27/05 Revised 11/2/05		CFR 64.1150 & FCC Order 99-223	LNPA-WG	Use of Evidence of Authorization	<p>Prior to placing orders on behalf of the end user, the New Local Service Provider is responsible for obtaining and having in its possession evidence of authorization.</p> <p>Evidence of authorization shall consist of verification of the end user's selection and authorization adequate to document the end user's selection of the New Local Service Provider.</p> <p>The evidence of authorization needs to be obtained and</p>



Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Industry Documentation Referenced	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
						<p>maintained as required by applicable federal and state regulation, e.g., CFR 64.1150, FCC Order 99-223, as amended from time to time.</p> <p>It is the LNPA WG's position that Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) of a port request shall not be predicated on the Old Local Service Provider obtaining a physical copy of the evidence of authorization from the New Local Service Provider. In the event of an end user allegation of an unauthorized change, the New Local Service Provider shall, upon request and in accordance with all applicable laws and rules, provide the evidence of authorization to the Old Local Service Provider.</p> <p>At its May 2005 meeting, the North American Numbering Council (NANC) endorsed the LNPA-WG's position as stated above.</p> <p>Subsequent to NANC's endorsement of the statement above, a related issue regarding requests for Customer Service Records (CSRs) was brought to the LNPA WG. The LNPA WG revised and endorsed its stated position as follows:</p> <p>It is the LNPA WG's position that Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) of a port request, or return of requested customer information, e.g., Customer Service Record (CSR), shall not be predicated on the Old Local Service Provider obtaining a physical copy of the evidence of authorization from the New Local Service Provider. In the event of an end user allegation of an unauthorized change, the New Local Service Provider shall, upon request and in accordance with all applicable laws and rules, provide the evidence of authorization to the Old Local Service Provider.</p> <p>The LNPA will also seek NANC's endorsement of the revised position statement.</p> <p>* Note: Evidence of authorization may consist of a Letter of Authorization (LOA) to review the end user's account and port his number, which may include a written contract with the end user or electronic signature, Proof of Authorization (POA), 3rd party verification, a voice recording verifying the end user's</p>



Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Industry Documentation Referenced	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
						request to switch local carriers, oral authorization with a unique identifier given by the end user, etc.
38	5/27/05		OBF Local Service Request (LSR)/Wireless Port Request (WPR)	LNPA-WG	Use of End Users Social Security Number and Tax ID on Local Service Requests/Wireless Port Requests	<p>It has been brought to the LNPA WG's attention that some service providers, when acting as the Old Local Service Provider in a port, are requiring the New Local Service Provider involved in the port to provide the Social Security Number (SSN) or Tax Identification Number of the consumer wishing to port their number for identification purposes.</p> <p>Due to concerns surrounding the use of one's Social Security Number or Tax Identification Number, which in many cases can be one's Social Security Number, in the commission of crimes such as identity theft, it is understandable that many consumers are hesitant or refuse to provide that information for identification purposes.</p> <p>Guidelines for the Wireless Port Request (WPR) state that either of the forms of consumer identification, Social Security Number/Tax Identification Number or Account Number, is mandatory only if the other is not provided on the LSR/WPR.</p> <p>It is the position of the LNPA WG that the consumer's Social Security Number/Tax Identification Number shall not be required on an LSR/WPR to port that consumer's telephone number if the consumer's Account Number associated with the Old Local Service Provider is provided on the LSR/WPR for identification.</p> <p>At its May 2005 meeting, the North American Numbering Council (NANC) endorsed the LNPA-WG's position as stated above, and agreed to send a letter to the FCC with its endorsement of the LNPA-WG position.</p>
39	10/3/05		OBF Local Service Request (LSR)/Wireless Port Request (WPR)	LNPA-WG	Identification of multiple errors on wireline Local Service Requests (LSRs) and Wireless Port Requests (WPRs)  "PIM 45.doc"	<p>When a Service Provider receives a port request, they should read as much of the port request as possible to identify and provide as much information <u>on all errors</u> as is possible to report on the response.</p> <p>Service providers should avoid a process of only reporting one error on each response to a port request resulting in a prolonged process of submitting multiple, iterative port requests for a single port, each time restarting the response timers.</p>


Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Industry Documentation Referenced	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
40	11/2/05		INC LRN Assignment Practices	LNPA-WG	Compliance to LRN Assignment Practices	<p>It has been brought to the attention of the LNPA WG that Service Providers are finding instances where an LRN has been entered on a Ported or Pooled telephone number in the NPAC, but the LRN on that record is not shown in the LERG. This situation is not causing call completion issues, but may cause additional time and work in Trouble resolution and identifying Carrier ownership of the LRN.</p> <p>The Industry Numbering Committee (INC) has established the "LRN Assignment Practices" to advise Service Providers on how to establish LRN's and notify the industry of their LRNs. The way the Service Providers notify the industry is detailed in the INC Assignment Practices, and it states, "The LRN will be published in the LERG."</p> <p>The LNPA WG agrees with the INC guidelines and recommends all Service Providers, to the extent possible based on current Business Integrated Routing and Rating Database Systems (BIRADS) edits, follow these practices and insure all their LRNs are published in the LERG.</p> <p>The INC "LRN Assignment Practices" are located on the following website. http://www.atis.org/inc/docs.asp</p> <p>Two examples where LRNs missing in the LERG may cause problems:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) When the LRN information in the LERG is used to identify the carrier to which to send Access Billing records, without the LRN being populated in the LERG, the records fall out of automated system processing and require manual handling to determine the carrier. 2) Even though the NPA-NXX is shown in the LERG and open in the network so the call should complete, if a trouble is experienced and a Trouble Ticket is opened, not having the LERG entry correct may lead to increased confusion and more investigation time during the resolution process to determine who the LRN belongs to.
41	12/22/05		ATIS Technical Requirement on Number Portability Switching Systems (T1.TRQ.2-2001) & ATIS Network	LNPA-WG	Compliance to JIP Standards and Guidelines	<p>The ISUP Jurisdiction Information Parameter (JIP) is a 6-digit parameter in the format of NPA-NXX that is signaled in the Initial Address Message (IAM) by the originating switch. The JIP is used by carriers downstream in the call path to identify the originating switch for billing settlement purposes. When</p>





Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Industry Documentation Referenced	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
			Interconnection Interoperability Forum (NIIF) Reference Document, Part III, Installation and Maintenance Responsibilities for SS7 Links and Trunks.			<p>carriers signal an incorrect JIP to another carrier, e.g., signaling an NPA-NXX in the JIP that is LERG-assigned to another carrier, this will result in improper identification of the originating switch.</p> <p>The LNPA WG supports and reiterates the following signaling requirements and guidelines for JIP as documented in ATIS' (www.atis.org) industry standard for Local Number Portability – Technical Requirement on Number Portability Switching Systems (T1.TRQ.2-2001) and in ATIS' Network Interconnection Interoperability Forum's (NIIF) (www.atis.org/niif/index.asp) Reference Document, Part III, Installation and Maintenance Responsibilities for SS7 Links and Trunks:</p> <p>From ATIS' Technical Requirement on Number Portability Switching Systems:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Page 6, Assumption 19: “An NPA-NXX used as a JIP is a LERG-assigned code on the switch.”</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">And, where technically feasible: Page 50, cites from REQ-03300: “The ISUP JIP parameter shall be included in the IAM for all line and private trunk call originations.”</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“The JIP identifies the switch from which the call originates, and can be recorded to identify that switch.”</p> <p>From ATIS NIIF Reference Document, Part III, Installation and Maintenance Responsibilities for SS7 Links and Trunks:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Rules for Populating JIP</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. JIP should be populated in the IAMs of all wireline and wireless originating calls where technically feasible. 2. JIP should be populated with an NPA-NXX that is assigned in the LERG to the originating switch or



Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Industry Documentation Referenced	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
						<p>MSC.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The NIIF does not recommend proposing that the JIP parameter be mandatory since calls missing any mandatory parameter will be aborted. However, the NIIF strongly recommends that the JIP be populated on all calls where technologically possible. 4. Where technically feasible if the originating switch or MSC serves multiple states/LATAs, then the switch should support multiple JIPs such that the JIP used for a given call can be populated with an NPA-NXX that is specific to both the switch as well as the state and LATA of the caller. 5. If the JIP cannot be populated at the state and LATA level, the JIP should be populated with an NPA-NXX specific to the originating switch or MSC where it is technically feasible. 6. Where the originating switch cannot signal JIP it is desirable that the subsequent switch in the call path populate the JIP using a data fill default associated with the incoming route. The value of the data fill item is an NPA-NXX associated with the originating switch or MSC and reflects its location. 7. When call forwarding occurs, the forwarded from DN (Directory Number) field will be populated, the JIP will be changed to a JIP associated with the forwarded from DN and the new called DN will be inserted in the IAM. 8. As per T1.TRQ2, the JIP should be reset when a new billable call leg is created.
42	8/31/06		<p>Refer to attached PIM 53</p>  <p>PIM 53 v5.doc</p>	LNPA-WG	Carriers taking back numbers that have been ported out because their systems do not reflect a valid FOC was sent.	<p>There have been instances of carriers taking back numbers that have been ported out several months or even years because their systems do not reflect a valid FOC was sent. In many cases they have not removed the number from their number inventory and they have re-assigned the TN to another customer.</p> <p>This PIM addresses instances where it was the intent of the end user to port to the New SP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providers should not arbitrarily port back numbers without attempting to contact and work with the New SP to resolve any disputes/issues related

Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Industry Documentation Referenced	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
						<p>to the port.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For an activated port that is disputed by the Old SP or not recognized in the systems of the Old SP, if it is determined that it was in fact the intent of the end user to port his/her number to the New SP, both providers should work together in resolving any systems true-up issues, e.g. reissuance of any necessary LSRs, when possible, without impacting the end user's service. In the case of a double assignment, between the two end users involved, the end user with the longer continuous service with that number shall retain the number, unless otherwise agreed to by the providers involved. In any case of an inadvertent port, defined here as a port where it was not the intention of the end user to port his/her number to the New SP, both providers will work together to restore the end user's service with the Old SP as quickly as possible, regardless of the time interval between activation of the inadvertent port and discovery of the inadvertent port.  <p>PIM 53 SERVICE PROVIDER CONTACT</p> <p>The attached file contains contact numbers/sites to be used by other providers to contact the applicable service provider to address PIM 53-related issues.</p>
43	11/25/06		 <p>NANC_399_VER_0_3.doc</p>	LNPA-WG	Alternative SPID field introduced in NANC 399	<p>Reseller SPIDs, for use in the alternative SPID data element of an SV, are created in NPAC's network data only upon an NPAC User's request. Consistent with the historical use of an entity's OCN as the entity's NPAC SPID, the industry strongly encourages each reseller to obtain an OCN from NECA for use as an NPAC SPID. This in turn allows the identity of a reseller associated with a ported number to be displayed as that number's "alternative SPID." Notwithstanding this strong industry preference, an NPAC User can request that the NPAC</p>




Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Industry Documentation Referenced	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
						assign a surrogate SPID to a reseller in NPAC's network data; that surrogate SPID then could be used as the alternative SPID to identify the reseller associated with a ported number. (Surrogate NPAC SPIDs are values that NECA does not assign as OCNs. Currently these values are made up of the alphanumeric values X000 through X999.)
44	12/19/2006		 CO41 Final Summary.pdf	LNPA-WG	Why carriers had discrepancies between PAS and NPAC for pooled blocks.	<p>Change Order 41 directed the Pooling Administrator (PA) to perform a one-time scrub of the entire PAS Database to reduce the likelihood that carriers will receive over-contaminated blocks or incorrectly identified contaminated blocks in lieu of pristine blocks. The PA provided a list of blocks to the NPAC in order to determine the contamination level of each block. The NPAC then provided the PA with the results; the PA compared the NPAC data against the block contamination status in PAS. Out of the 189,552 available blocks, 10,758 resulted in a discrepancy, which meant that the information entered by the Service Provider into PAS or the NPAC was incorrect, and in addition, out of the 10,758 discrepant blocks, 506 blocks appeared to be over 10% contaminated. The carriers involved in these discrepancies were notified to correct these discrepancies. Following is a list of explanations from the carriers as to why they had discrepancies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of communication between the carriers departments; • The SPs did not realize they needed to do intra-SP ports prior to donating blocks; • The SPs did not have a process in place to notify the PA when the contamination status of a previously donated block goes from contaminated to non-contaminated; • Some SPs mistakenly believed that updating NRUF automatically updated the NPAC; and • Some SPs thought they could donate the block even though it was over 10% contaminated, if the numbers were ported to another carrier.
45	05/07/07		 PIM 58 v3.doc	LNPA-WG	When Subscriber is unable to port their telephone numbers because the NXX code is not opened for	<p>There have been instances where the LERG assignee of an NXX code has not opened a code to portability in NPAC, and either cannot be contacted to do so, or refuses to do so.</p> <p>Individual circumstances may vary depending on the situation.</p>


Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Industry Documentation Referenced	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
					portability in the NPAC SMS	<p>In some cases, the NXX may have been opened for portability in the LERG but not in the NPAC SMS. In other cases, the NXX may not have been opened for portability in the LERG or the NPAC SMS. It may be that if the NSP or the NPAC Administrator contacts the OSP, the situation will be resolved. But in those situations where the OSP can't be contacted or refuses to cooperate, the following procedure should be followed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The NSP should document attempts to contact the OSP to request that the NXX be opened in the NPAC SMS. 2. If the NSP attempts to make contact are unsuccessful, the NSP should contact the NPAC Administrator. The NPAC Administrator should attempt to contact the OSP to request that the code be opened in the NPAC SMS. Attempts should be documented. 3. If neither the NSP nor the NPAC Administrator can make contact with the OSP or if the OSP refuses to cooperate, the NSP should contact the appropriate regulatory authorities for assistance. The NSP should provide details to the regulatory authority including the Service Provider Identification (SPID) of the OSP who should have opened the code. 4. The regulatory authority may convince the OSP to open the code, or may authorize the NPAC Administrator to open the code to portability in the NPAC SMS. Any such authorization directed to the NPAC Administrator shall include the NSP-provided SPID of the code holder under which the code shall be opened in the NPAC. Upon receipt of such regulatory authorization, the NPAC Administrator shall proceed with opening the code in the NPAC SMS. 5. The OSP should have the LERG updated to show the code as portable if it does not already do so.
46	05-07-07		 "PIM 50.doc"	LNPA-WG	Intermodal Port delayed due to CSR too large.	<p>There have been instances where wireline to wireless ports fail the automated process because they are from large accounts where the Customer Service Record (CSR) is too large to return on a CSR query.</p> <p>At the November 2006 NANC meeting, NANC recommended that carriers should be following the OBF guidelines. The OBF LSOG guidelines have options for providing a CSR for a TN</p>

Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Industry Documentation Referenced	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
						with or without directory, or the entire account with or without directory. If wireline carriers sent only the information requested in the customer inquiry per the LSOG CSI guidelines, this error would be greatly reduced if not eliminated.
47	05-07-07		 LNPA WG Position on 24 Hour FOC v3.doc  3rd report wireline wireless integration fi  FCC-03-284A1.pdf	LNPA-WG	LNPA-WG Position on 24 Hour Firm Order Confirmation	<p>It has been brought to the attention of the Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG) that a number of Service Providers participating in local number portability are failing to comply with the requirement that all simple wireline and intermodal port requests shall be confirmed by the Old Service Provider (OSP) within 24 hours, excluding weekends and holidays.</p> <p>The Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) process is defined by the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS) Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF). The timing requirements for return of the FOC are cited in a number of industry and regulatory documents, including the North American Numbering Council Local Number Portability Administration Working Group's 3rd Report on Wireless Wireline Integration, dated September 30, 2000, which states, "An LSR is submitted by the NSP (New Service Provider) to the OSP (Old Service Provider). When an LSR is submitted to the OSP, the OSP will return either an error message or a LSC (FOC). SPs are required to provide a LSC/FOC within 24 hours of receiving a LSR." In addition, in Paragraph 49 of its Memorandum Opinion and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FCC 03-284A1), adopted November 7, 2003, the FCC stated, "the wireline NANC LNP Process Flows establish that the FOC must be finalized within 24 hours of receiving the port request."</p> <p>It is the LNPA WG's position that the return of either the Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) in response to a valid Local Service Request (LSR), or an appropriate error message in response to an invalid LSR, by the Old Service Provider for a simple port request shall not exceed 24 hours, excluding weekends and holidays.</p> <p>At the April 17, 2007 NANC meeting, the LNPA WG submitted this Position Paper in order to bring this issue and the LNPA WG's position to the attention of the NANC and the FCC.</p>
48	06-08-07		 PIM 32v4.doc	LNPA-WG	Porting of Wireline Reseller Numbers	<p>PIM 32 seeks to address issues related to the process of obtaining a Customer Service Record (CSR) for wireline reseller customers. The CSR contains information necessary to complete a Local Service Request (LSR) for porting a wireline</p>

Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Industry Documentation Referenced	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
						<p>number. In some cases, carriers are not able to obtain an end user's specific CSR information from some wireline network service providers when attempting to port telephone numbers (TNs) associated with reseller accounts. For example, two of four RBOCs refuse to send the CSR information to the New Local Service Provider (NLSP) because they have been instructed by their resellers not to share the end user's specific information which the resellers consider to be proprietary.</p> <p>This is a critical problem. For those reseller errors where there is a workaround, many of the port requests are significantly delayed before completion. In some cases there are no workaround solutions and end users who want to port their number cannot. Those customers either give up on porting their number, or cannot keep their number and must change to a new number. It is not always possible to work with the resellers to obtain the information needed to populate the LSR. It is often difficult to find someone with the reseller that can support a port and provide the needed information.</p> <p>The failure to port wireline reseller TNs can be resolved. Direction by resellers to Old Network Service Providers (ONSPs) to provide the specific customer information where possible would greatly reduce the unsuccessful ports. Resellers should not be allowed to withhold end user specific customer information necessary for the porting process.</p> <p>At the April 17, 2007 NANC meeting, the LNPA WG submitted this final Position Paper in order to bring the LNPA WG's consensus position to the attention of the NANC and the FCC.</p>
49	06-08-07		 PIM 59.doc	LNPA-WG	Unlocking of 911 record on ports to VoIP providers	<p>Questions have been raised and Issues have been identified by a number of VoIP providers related to the process of unlocking the 911 database on ports to VoIP providers.</p> <p>For future inquiries related to 911 issues for VoIP porting, it is recommended that carriers review the materials published and approved by the NENA at www.NENA.org.</p>
50	07-06-07		 PIM 60.doc	LNPA-WG	Porting in conjunction with Foreign Exchange (FX) Service	<p>Regarding the attached PIM 60 and the porting scenario described within, the LNPA WG reached consensus at their May 2007 meeting that this is a legitimate porting scenario provided that each of the following caveats are met in providing service to the customer by the New Service Provider.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The customer would like to receive calls to their

Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Industry Documentation Referenced	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
						<p>number(s) at a location of theirs that is physically outside of the Rate Center associated with their number(s).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The customer understands that these numbers must continue to be rated in accordance with the Rate Center currently associated with their number(s) and does not want them to take on the rating characteristics of the Rate Center of their new location. • The New Service Provider already serves the Rate Center associated with the customer's number(s) out of the same switch to which they want to port this customer's number(s). • The New Service Provider switch that already serves the Rate Center of the customer's number(s) has an existing POI at the ILEC's tandem over which calls to these numbers are routed. If this customer's number(s) are ported into the New Service Provider switch, they would be routed over the same POI, and then the New Service Provider would deliver the calls to the customer's premise that is located outside of the Rate Center associated with the customer's Number(s). • The New Service Provider offers a tariffed and/or publicly published foreign exchange (FX) service in accordance with regulatory requirements that would cover this situation. Calls to and from customers located in the Rate Center associated with these ported numbers and the customer served by the New Service Provider will be routed exactly the same whether the New Service Provider assigns the customer a phone number from its 1K block of numbers in that Rate Center or whether the New Service Provider ports the numbers. This customer will be served out of the New Service Provider's tariffed and/or publicly published foreign exchange (FX) service offering in accordance with regulatory requirements. • The LSR submitted by the New Service Provider reflects the customer's original service location as recorded by the Old Service Provider.

Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Industry Documentation Referenced	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
51	11-05-07		 PIM 56 v2.doc	LNPA-WG	Proper and Timely Updates to LNP Routing Databases	<p>The following high-level process is recommended as a guide to assist in determining the cause of post-port call routing issues.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Process</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Customer ports number. 2. Ported customer reports problem receiving some phone calls or another customer reports problem with making calls to the ported number. 3. New Network Service Provider (NNSP) checks to ensure that all provider LSMSS' active subscription version (SV) data is correct by launching an audit request. 4. NSP reports the problem to the Telco that is routing calls with incorrect LRN (SCP/STP is discrepant with NPAC). 5. These issues are reported to the Telco's Network Operations Center (NOC). 6. All involved Telco's work together to identify and correct the problem. 7. Discrepant Telco will notify to the reporting Telco when the problem has been found and corrected. 8. NSP may notify the customer that the problem has been corrected. <p>For an additional guide to troubleshooting in a multiple service provider environment, the following link will access the ATIS Network Interconnection Interoperability Forum's (NIIF's) <i>Guidelines for Reporting Local Number Portability Troubles in a Multiple Service Provider Environment</i>. http://www.atis.org/niif/Docs/atis0300082.pdf</p>
52	11-05-07		 PIM 57 v3.doc	LNPA-WG	Resellers Discontinuing Business and/or Declaring Bankruptcy	<p>The attached document reflects the LNPA WG's consensus for a strategy to address porting issues resulting from Resellers claiming bankruptcy and/or going out of business.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">  Reseller Bankruptcy Plan.doc </p>

Item #	Date Logged	Recommend Chg to Reqs	Industry Documentation Referenced	Submitted by Team	Major Topic	Decisions/Recommendations
53	11-05-07		 PIM 62 v2.doc	LNPA-WG	Duration of Porting Outages Due to Planned SP Maintenance	<p>Every attempt should be made to perform planned maintenance during the regularly scheduled Sunday SP maintenance windows.</p> <p>An Industry Best Practice has been agreed upon to limit the length of time for planned service provider downtime to a maximum of 60 consecutive hours as it relates to Local Number Portability outages. Additionally, Trading Partners should provide 30 days notice of planned porting outages. If 30 days is not possible, a minimum of 14 days notice should be provided.</p> <p>It is recognized that there may be emergency situations that could require outages within the proposed minimum 14 day planned outage notification window. The Suggested Resolution of PIM 62 is not meant to prevent any required outages under these extreme emergency conditions.</p>